## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

DONALD R	AY DEAN	§	
Petitioner,		§	
vs.	•	<b>§</b> §	No. 3-07-CV-0470-N
	L QUARTERMAN, Director	§	
Texas Department of Criminal Justice Correctional Institutions Division		§ §	
	ORDER OF THE COURT ON THE	FOREGOIN	NG RECOMMENDATION
	dering the record in this case and the a edure 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253 (c), to		nendation, and pursuant to Federal Rule of eby finds and orders:
IFP ST	<u>ΓATUS</u> :		
( )	the party appealing is GRANTED in j	forma pauper	is status on appeal.
(X)	the party appealing is proceeding in forma pauperis.		
( )	the party appealing is DENIED <i>in for</i> for the following reasons:	ma pauperis	status on appeal
	the appeal is not taken in good incorporates by reference the M in this case on this Court finds that the appear frivolous. See Harkins v. Rolloward v. King, 707 F. 2d 2d (1) the person appealing is not a the person appealing has not of Rules of Appellate Procedure	od faith. In su Magistrate Jud I I presents no l oberts, 935 F. 15, 219-20 (5' pauper; complied with e and /or 28 U	p. P. 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (a)(3), that apport of this finding, the Court adopts and Ige's Findings and Recommendation entered Based upon the Magistrate Judge's findings, egal points of arguable merit and is therefore Supp. 871, 873 (S. D. Miss. 1996) (citing the Cir. 1983)).  In the requirements of Rule 24 of the Federal J.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) as ordered by the Court. ed on).
<u>COA</u> :			
( )	a Certificate of Appealability is GRANTED on the following issues:		
<b>(X)</b>	a Certificate of Appealability is DENIED. The Court hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation filed in this case on May 9, 2007, which were adopted by the District Court on July 5, 2007, in support of its finding that Petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that reasonable jurists could conclude that the habeas corpus petition is not barred by the statute of limitations. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 120 S. Ct. 1595, 1602, 146 L. Ed. 2d 542 (2000).		

SIGNED August 24, 2007.